

REMARKS

A telephone conference between the Examiner and Arthur Ortega (one of the applicant's undersigned attorneys) was held on December 27, 2006. The applicant and Mr. Ortega wish to thank the Examiner for his time and consideration for such conference.

Claims 1, 5 and 8 were amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schuster* (US 6,731,630) in view of *Waites* (6,788,769).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part as follows:

"... the electronic mail address having a local part and a domain part, the local part is separated from the domain part with an at mark symbol "@", and the local part includes the telephone number of the destination and the domain part includes the domain name of the destination telecommunication services operator without including the telephone number of the destination."

In other words, the email address includes a local part and a domain part. The local part includes the telephone number of a destination. The domain part includes the domain name of the destination telecommunication services operator but does not include the telephone number of the destination. The local part is separated from the domain part with an at symbol "@." For example, FIG. 4B shows an email address comprising a local and domain part as recited in amended claim 1 of the present invention.

In explaining the rejection, the Examiner indicates that *Schuster* does not expressly disclose communicating to the destination the electronic mail information using the email address and forming the electronic mail address for sending the electronic mail address. The Examiner goes on to assert that it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of *Waites*

(col. 1, lines 39-41, col. 5, lines 66-67, col. 6, lines 1-5) to the system of *Schuster* (col. 14, lines 44-56, col. 15, lines 58-67, and col. 18, lines 9-24). It is respectfully submitted that the portions of *Schuster* and *Waites* applied by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the above recited feature of amended claim 1.

Schuster relates to dialing a VoIP telephone to contact a VoIP telephone having a telephone address of the form [person]@[domain]. For example, "Tom@company.com." In *Schuster*, rather than dialing the complete alphanumeric address, a number may be dialed. The number to be dialed is a numerical equivalent mapping of the alphanumeric address.

Waites relates to the use of a telephone number as the primary component of, among other things, an email address. For example, a person with a telephone number of (512) 123-4567, would have an email address of "123567@us512.net" (see col. 6, lines 12-17 of *Waites*) In *Waites*, both the local portion (i.e., "123567") and the domain portion (i.e., "us512.net") of the email address includes telephone number information. In particular, the domain portion (i.e., "us512.net") includes telephone number information "512."

The cited portions of the cited art, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above-identified features of amended claim 1 for the following reasons.

In *Schuster*, the first part of the input identification number is not a telephone number as in amended claim 1. Moreover, in *Waites*, both the local part and the domain part of the email address include telephone number information. In contrast, in amended claim 1 of the present application, the domain part does not include telephone number information.

Moreover, *Schuster* fails to render amended claim 1 obvious because *Schuster* relates to placing a VoIP telephone call and not sending an email. Moreover, although *Schuster*

notes that a VoIP telephone number may resemble an email address, however, that is not an assertion that the method of *Schuster* can be successfully adapted for sending emails. Rather, *Schuster* mentions an e-mail address merely to describe a protocol such as SIP in a more familiar context and not for sending an email.

In addition, even if the teachings of *Schuster* and *Waites* were combined, the combination would not result in an email address as in amended claim 1 of the present invention. That is, such combination may instead provide a resultant email address having local and domain parts, in which the resultant local part may comprise an identifier of a VoIP telephone number, as taught in *Schuster*. However, as explained above, such an identifier is not a telephone number of a destination as in the claimed invention. In addition, the resultant domain part may comprise telephone number information of a person, as taught in *Waites*. Such resultant combination is substantially different than claim 1. That is, in claim 1 the local part of the email address contains a telephone number and not the domain part of the email address.

Therefore, since neither *Schuster* nor *Waites* discloses the above identified features of claim 1 and because *Schuster* fails to provide motivation to combine itself with *Waites*, the rejection of amended claim 1 of *Schuster* in view of *Waites* is improper.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of *Schuster* and *Waites*.

Independent claims 5 and 8 were amended in a similar manner as claim 1. For similar or somewhat similar reasons with regard to claim 1, amended independent claims 5 and 8 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of *Schuster* and *Waites*.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, and 10 depend from one of the independent claims, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of *Schuster* and *Waites* for at least the reasons previously described.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Arthur S. Ortega

Registration No.: 53,422
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

721054_1.DOC